

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/667,284

Applicant(s)

DICKSON ET AL.

Examiner

Drew E Becker

Art Unit

1761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Drew E Becker

(3) _____

(2) L. Grant Foster

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 09 December 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: Reese et al

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached g) ☐ was not reached h) ☒ N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed the Final Rejection and Reese et al. Discussed the claims in general. The examiner suggested claiming the device in greater detail regarding the "all in one" concept. A continuation may be filed.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Drew Becker
Examiner's signature, if required

12-7-02